

The Classical Weekly

MAR 21 1918

VOL. XI.

MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1918

No. 20

SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS

By The Classical Association of the Atlantic States

(1) THE PRACTICAL VALUE OF LATIN (AND GREEK)

A pamphlet of 40 pages, giving expressions of lawyers, physicians, journalists, engineers, scientists, educators and business men favorable to the Classics, as subjects having a direct meaning and use for those who plan to engage in various forms of practical life. Speaking from personal experience the men and women quoted in this pamphlet insist, unhesitatingly, that the study of the Classics is a rational way of fitting one's self for practical life. Copies may be obtained at the following rates:

12 copies	\$.50	200 copies	\$6.00
25 copies	1.00	300 copies	8.00
50 copies	1.90	400 copies	10.00
100 copies	3.50	500 copies	11.00
160 copies	5.00		

(2) Reprint, in the form of a 16 page pamphlet, from THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8.178-182, of a paper by Professor Lane Cooper, Assistant Professor of English, Cornell University, entitled,

THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH AND THE STUDY OF THE CLASSICS

This paper contains a striking statement of the value, in a vital field, of a classical training. Every teacher of Latin and Greek, especially Greek, should read what Professor Cooper has to say, and should set it before his pupils. Copies may be had at the following rates:

12 copies	\$.25
25 copies50
60 copies	1.00
100 copies	1.50
200 or more copies	one cent each

These two pamphlets deserve wide circulation.
For copies address,

CHARLES KNAPP,
Barnard College, New York City.

Latin Plays for Student Performances and Reading

By **JOHN J. SCHLICHER**, *Indiana State Normal School*

Seven Latin plays written for performances in high schools and for rapid oral reading by high-school pupils and others in the early stages of Latin. The plays are written in a simple, idiomatic style, interspersed with lively dialogues. Full stage directions have been included. 75 cents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Saccus Malorum (*The Sack of Apples*)
 Tirones (*The Recruits*)
 Exitus Helvetiorum (*The Departure of the Helvetians*)
 Cicero Candidatus (*When Cicero was Candidate*)
 Coniuratio (*The Conspiracy*)
 Dido
 Andromeda



GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue

New York

The classics are most helpful in the matter of correct English style.—WILLIAM H. TAFT.

**MORRIS & MORGAN
LATIN SERIES**

FOR COLLEGES

The books in this series for Colleges have been edited by College professors who are actually engaged in the teaching of these authors.

Franklin & Greene's Selections from
Latin Prose Authors for Sight Reading

Moore's Cicero de Senectute

Price's Cicero's Laelius de Amicitia

Burton's Selections from Livy

Merrill's Lucretius. *De Rerum Natura*

Robinson's Selections from the Public and
Private Law of the Romans.

Moore's Horace. Odes, Epodes and
Carmen Saeculare

Morris's Horace. Satires and Epistles

Moore's Horace. Odes, Epodes, and
Carmen Saeculare; and Morris's Horace.
Satires and Epistles.

Smith's Tibullus

The *Corpus Tibullianum*, edited with introduction and notes on Books I-II, and IV, 2-14.

Gudeman's Latin Literature of the
Empire.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. XI

NEW YORK, MARCH 18, 1918

No. 20

THE NEW PROBLEMS OF THE SECONDARY LATIN TEACHER IN FIRST AND SECOND YEAR LATIN¹

Being a Secondary Latin teacher in a Public School, just at present, is an interesting occupation. In a comparatively short time we have already adapted ourselves to more actual changes than, I believe, any other group has—not only changes which have directly affected the status of Latin, but general High School and administrative changes which have reacted indirectly upon the strictly academic subjects. As the end is not yet, and there is no certainty as to when or what the end will be, teaching Latin, just at present, especially in the first and second years, is quite a serious matter—serious because it is fast coming to pass that the battle for all future Latin, one might say the whole Latin cause, is won or lost within this part of the course. Classical teaching has always demanded unusual preparatory study and excellent class-room methods, but never more so than now. So many new problems have developed quite recently within this field that it has become necessary for the Secondary teacher to make over his ideas almost completely and to work out his own solution.

The most difficult phase of this, it seems to me, is not coping with the ultimate reaction, when it comes, no matter how radical it may be, but rather dealing wisely with the constantly shifting period in which we are now. Obviously, the case calls not only for abundant energy and resourcefulness, but quite as necessarily for an open-mindedness toward the changing educational views. It is my purpose to present some of the recent developments in our Latin situation. And, although when compared with previous conditions and standards, the present seem inferior, it is not my intent to draw comparisons, but rather to give an account of present conditions, just as we find them, with the aim of emphasizing how different the whole field is, how differently it must be treated, and how important it is that we understand it.

To my mind the most decided change is the change in student type. In the Latin classes we are teaching, in the main, the younger brothers and the younger sisters of former students. The sources of our supply are therefore not greatly changed. But the former group

entered High School ordinarily quite mature, responsible, resourceful young persons with some clearly defined aims, who could easily be dealt with in the mass, yet were capable of taking care of themselves, individually, in the important matter of home preparation. The present entering students are quite as bright, but not nearly so mature, at least in habits of study, much less responsible in sense of duty, with far less initiative in meeting School obligations. Obstacles discourage them much more easily, causing them to give up, to change plans, and to follow lines of less resistance. Then, a certain restlessness pervades their work; they crave the interesting and would reject all else. Furthermore, there is a great difference in mental training. Formerly, at least in our own experience, the Eighth Grade was more taxing than the first year in the Secondary School, and even eight to ten years ago the transitional stage was not difficult mentally. Now, definite training must be given, constantly, in connection with one's subject, which makes a very different problem of our work. The great care, observation, and accuracy which Latin requires, even from the first lesson, make it really very taxing and difficult for untrained pupils. The great percentage of failures in Latin and in Mathematics points its own moral. We have been forced to see that our first and second year requirements were poorly adapted to our present needs. We have come to realize the wisdom of much slower procedure, better graded material, at the start, with time to do the first work thoroughly, to review frequently, really to train through our subject, to give the requisite individual attention and direction, and, above all, to interest and hold.

Consider a moment the bearing of the present status of formal grammar on the first year Latin case. Grammar, the bane of boyhood, as a Vassar professor calls it, is abandoned, in the Grades, as futile. The Secondary School has had to accept this decision and to be governed accordingly. We Latin teachers have long been accustomed to strengthening weak places and to giving new insight into language structure; now it is obligatory on us to lay foundations in grammar, step by step, as needed. If this change had come upon us with the admission that Latin is the best medium through which to teach grammar, we would readily and happily have accepted the added responsibility.

¹This paper was read at the Eleventh Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at the University of Pittsburgh, April 28, 1917.

Aside from being less trained and from being unprepared as students, the present-day pupils have developed a trait which comes more directly as one of the reactions of the new educational ideas. They hear these discussed and are greatly influenced by them. Especially they hear talk about the practical ends of education. So, accordingly, at every turn they ask, What's the use? Now the answer to this question has never been hard to give to those who can comprehend, but it is often hard to give an adequate reply to immature students. One can't talk to them of mental development, or of mental discipline, or of culture, or of language foundation; one can't advise them to wait two years—they have no tolerance for postponed results, but expect each subject to justify itself in a day for day way. Consequently, each semester's work must yield its own returns, cumulatively, in the student's own experience. No one will deny that this question, What's the use?, from within and without has awakened us Secondary teachers (who needed an awakening) to reveal convincingly the immediate benefits of Latin—benefits within the reach and the comprehension of every student. The great and increased need of the dictionary, just at this particular time, when students are first coming in frequent contact with longer, more learned, technical words, is such a ripe opportunity to present daily and systematically the important subject of derivation. No phase of the work appeals more, in interest or in practical worth.

So far, in describing the type of students, I have mentioned characteristics which can be met by the individual teacher with the use of intelligent insight and effort. To do this involves keeping alertly in touch with the host of excellent suggestions and experiments coming from all over the country. It means analyzing one's own local situation, so that the modifications may be sane, in keeping with the Latin past, yet in wise comprehension of present needs.

But some other reactions are not so easily counteracted. The policy of a widely extended curriculum, combined with a very free elective system, has had some temporary effects, especially in certain subjects, including Latin, not only unintended, but entirely unforeseen. The aim of this policy, to throw open countless avenues for selfdiscovery and selfmastery, was and is undeniably fine. Dr. Snedden, in describing the High School of Tomorrow, says:

The field of human culture is so large, its valuable prospects so many that each learner, under wise guidance, will usually make his own individual program. But it will be assumed <here's our difficulty> that the guardians of the pupils are disposed to do things, educationally, that will prove most profitable to them and that advisory agencies will be found in school, to indicate what lines of study, of personal training, of culture, will prove most worth while.

He adds:

We may hope that the doctrine of innate depravity of the secondary school students, as well as the incor-

rigible imbecility of their parents, will have been rendered innocuous, if not obsolete.

While the terms in the latter sentence strike us as too strong—we would substitute 'thoughtless', 'pleasure-loving', 'distracted' for "depraved" students, and 'too busy', 'over-indulgent', 'lax' for "imbecile" parents, yet it more truly represents the first reactions we are feeling from the wide elective system and extensive curriculum. In all probability time will provide the certainty of wise guidance and advice, in the proper selection of subjects. I am concerned with the temporary condition and its effect on the Latin cause. The elective system is now in about as full operation in the Secondary School as in the College. English alone is required of all. This means that the average fourteen-year old student is not only selecting his own subjects, but is continuing or discontinuing them at his own desire; parents and teachers really have very little to do with it. Theoretically, it is well that each subject should make its own appeal and should maintain its own worth. But this theory requires that the one choosing between subjects shall be a judge of values. Needless to say, a fourteen-year old boy is not. To him the doctrine of interest too often means the least work for credit. No subject with heavy demands for outside preparation has favor. It is the day of the easy subject versus the hard, the day of avoiding difficulties instead of mastering them. Now, Latin will never be an easy subject. It still demands qualities of persistence, regularity of preparation, concentration at a time when attractions and distractions are abundant within and without, when most other subjects have lessened their requirements, especially in outside preparation, but give, at present, identical credits. Dr. Snedden realizes "the desirability of eventually evaluating all these subjects somehow in terms of time and effort which should be properly given them". This adjustment will prove a boon to us, but just now languages, mathematics and certain sciences are subjected to very unequal competition. The answer made to the Dean of an Eastern College has many counterparts, just now, in the Secondary School. He asked a Freshman for an explanation of his choice of subjects, saying that they were all good subjects, but that he couldn't see any correlation in them. The reply came frankly, "None of them are before ten a. m. or above the first floor of any building".

Another interesting development has been the effect of the withdrawal of College requirements. After all, the traditional reason for taking Latin, in the minds of the pupils, has been as a College preparatory subject. Its value per se has not been sufficiently emphasized all along the course. Unquestionably our teaching has been at fault in this respect. We had not realized the bearing the word 'requirement' has had in making and maintaining elections. Even now students who are preparing for such Colleges as

still require four years of Latin go along contentedly in their four years' work. This academic group still forms a very substantial, fine class. But it is seemingly a natural student trait not to take anything beyond requirements, but to take anything quite cheerfully, if it is required. Even English, if not required, would not be continued by all students. Consequently, in the case of students preparing for Colleges which accept two years of Latin, Latin is apt to be taken for just two years. Of course, it is likewise true that, just as Latin requirements in the past have crowded out the possibility of taking other subjects, now the reverse is true. The increased desirability of more science, mathematics, and modern languages is doing much to curtail the amount of Latin taken.

Such reactions from the elective system and the withdrawal of College requirements, whether temporary or permanent, are outside the responsibility of Secondary Latin teachers. But another phase and one which occasions loss of students lies within our own realm and control. Every Secondary teacher affirms that the critical period in the four years' course is from the middle of the first year to the middle of the second year. Here are demanded the best teaching, the best judgment, and the deepest insight. Our policy in the past has been, too often, one of vigorous and rigorous preparatory work as a foundation, leaving many by the wayside. For the strictly academic group this method still has its old-time splendid training and it would be a pity, for them, to have it abandoned. But the group to whom this entirely analytical, grammatical method appeals is growing smaller, and the unrelenting continuance of the method undoubtedly accounts for much of the loss of students at the end of the second year. Considering the present student type and present general conditions, one must conclude that the first year and a half are too much of a struggle, without manifestly compensating results. Foreign languages and some mathematics are now the only subjects where there is a direct continuity of subject-matter from year to year. The pupil's record in the first year directly affects the second year. The average student under present requirements has not done the first year thoroughly enough. This necessarily means a strenuous second year in which all previous neglect must not only be corrected but must be paid for dearly. For the student with sufficient mettle this has proven a valuable experience, salutary for his general student habits and for all his future Latin work. The average Cicero student forgets his Caesar troubles in the satisfaction of his third year. On the other hand, it has been discouraging to many, who can not realize that abundant returns are coming. The temptation is strong to make a brand new start in another subject. Modern languages draw many such recruits and profit greatly by this Latin experience. To prevent this discouragement, to tide over this particular period, to meet all the complex conditions is undoubtedly our greatest task.

Consider, lastly, two administrative practices which, although necessitated by schedule difficulties, enter vitally into the matter before us. First, I name the possibility of shifting students from one Latin teacher to another, within short periods of time. To what extent this is true, generally, I do not know, but it is possible here to have students change teachers every five months, either as a whole class, or individually, so that no class works under identical conditions more than a semester. Even with uniformity of standards, there cannot be sufficient uniformity of methods or exact equality of teaching to operate without a loss of time and students. While this has come about as a result of the semester plan, it has demonstrated quickly and conclusively the great desirability of continuity of teaching methods for at least a year and preferably for the full first two years, giving ample time to achieve results with a given method. After the two years, the shifting seems to have some decided advantages and occasions no loss.

Secondly, the present class-groups bring together students who are taking Latin, for different periods of time, with widely different aims. In the same first year, you may have—you cannot always know—those who intend to take Latin but one year, those who intend to take it a year and a half, those who plan to take it two years, and so on throughout the four years, and with motives varying accordingly. Adequate benefits for all must be constantly considered. Each semester's work must justify itself to the student, must be complete in itself, and yet form a part of a continuous whole. Later, it can doubtless be so managed, as has already been done to some extent in some places, that proper subdivisions with differentiated material and methods will be possible. Just now, in this adjustment period, all elements must be served and conserved in the same group.

Such, then, are the complex elements entering into the Latin work of the first and second years and making the whole situation very different and very critical. It therefore rests as a grave responsibility and duty on us Secondary teachers to handle this period with most thoughtful care and insight, realizing that so worthy a cause is in our keeping.

PEABODY HIGH SCHOOL, Pittsburgh.

MARY L. BREENE.

REVIEWS¹

A Defense of Classical Education. By R. W. Livingstone. London: Macmillan and Co. (1916). Pp. xi + 278.

Mr. Livingstone's book is written with a view to English conditions. It is a serious attempt to analyze the educational values of classical instruction. Admitting the prevalent discontent with the educational

¹This review is reprinted, with very slight changes, from *School and Society* 7:175-177 (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 11:144). We are indebted to both Professor Lodge and Professor Cattell, Editor of *School and Society*, for their consent to the reprinting.
C. K.

system of England, much aggravated by the World War, and the tendency to decry it in comparison with the assumed efficiency of the German system on the ground that the Classics dominate the English system, while science is the foundation of the German, Mr. Livingstone asserts that the German system itself gives a large place to instruction in the Classics and maintains that the weakness of English education is due rather to ineffective teaching and to the small effort made to foster a belief in knowledge. He recognizes the value of physical science, but claims that it involves specialization before the necessary general training has been acquired, and further that life will compel commercial or professional knowledge but will find no place later for the study of the humanities. Physical science, too, leads to a knowledge of nature and natural processes, while the humanities assist us directly to a knowledge of man, develop flexibility of mind, and help us to see the world with imagination.

In defense of Greek Mr. Livingstone urges that the Greek civilization is the foundation of our own, and that the Greek literature, in particular, affords the key-thoughts on which our intellectual life depends. While Latin literature does not stand on the same plane as the Greek, Rome represents character, thus supplementing the Greek, which was weak on this side, and the Latin language is unique in its power of concise expression. The study of the vernacular or of modern languages can not replace the Classics, because of the nearness and similarity of ideas involved, and also because of the artificial character of modern expression as compared with the completeness, simplicity, lucidity, and directness of the classical style. Latin grammar and prose composition are defended as tests of intellectual ability and as developing concentration of mind and precision of expression.

All of these arguments and claims are very familiar to teachers in this country. And it may be said with all truth that in the main they are sound. As a reasonably full account of the advantages that should accrue from classical study they leave little to be desired. But as to their value in the controversy now raging as to the place of the Classics in our educational system not so much can be said. The difficulty, however, does not lie with the classicist, but with the general educators, who have not as yet made any serious attempt to attack the problem in any comprehensive way. As we see the situation, we should like to get definite answers to the following questions: (1) Is the basis of education in our Schools to be (a) internal, i.e. interest, whether spontaneous or stimulated by the teacher, or (b) external, i.e. the authority of the teacher or the School, or (c) a combination of both. The last seems to be the logical choice and is supported by many good critics. If we accept this as the correct answer, then comes the further question: (2) Among the subjects whose study is due largely to authority and whose aim is to develop the capacity for voluntary

effort and attention, should a place be assigned to language? If this is answered in the affirmative, we come to the final question: (3) Are the Classics better than the Modern Languages or the vernacular for this training? For the answer to the last question Mr. Livingstone's book well supplements the Princeton volume and the Michigan volume. But these questions, particularly the first two, should be definitely settled for at least a term of years by some body whose findings would meet with wide acceptance by reason of the acknowledged competence of its members, not by men without vision, ideals or breadth of training, such as are at present most in evidence. Classical teachers would be the first to welcome such a decision.

Of particular interest to us in this country is Mr. Livingstone's last chapter, Reforms. He realizes that the various advantages which he claims for the classical training are not obtained by many students, and sees the remedy in some change in the method of instruction, not, however, for all students, but particularly for students in the University. Students in the early years, corresponding to our High Schools, owing to their immaturity, should expect, he thinks, little more than good habits of study and a better feeling for English. The University training, however, is too rigidly linguistic, and should be modified by the inclusion of a certain amount of the *Realien* of ancient civilization, "a change", as he says, "less of curriculum than of the angle of view". He would articulate everything studied with the facts of our modern life, and interpret modern civilization as the development of ancient.

This too is nothing new to us. But we would apply this remedy much earlier. I have recently been looking over a Junior Latin Book by Messrs. Forsythe and Gummere, in which, even in the work of the Seventh Grade, a large amount of space is devoted to what are called on the title page Roman Ideas, that is, the Roman ways of looking at many familiar things, such as the universe, water, fire, the family, the School, and so forth. Incidentally, this slight study of such topics leads to many interesting lights on origins, quite within the range of the child's mind, and yet of considerable value in themselves. In most of our Colleges the steady insistence upon the monotones of grammar and syntax which used to be characteristic of every teacher has almost entirely disappeared. Our danger now is rather that we should go to the other extreme and not lay enough emphasis upon the absolute essential of language study, that is, the language.

GONZALEZ LODGE.

The Prosecution of Jesus: Its Date, History and Legality. By Richard Wellington Husband. Princeton University Press (1916). Pp. 312.

The general contents of this volume are apparent from its title. It is a work of close argumentation and the conclusions are conveniently summarized on pages 279-282. They are as follows:

The crucifixion occurred on Friday, April 3, 33, and not on Friday, April 7, 30.

The arrest was duly and legally effected by officers of the Jews under the authority of the Sanhedrin. No Roman officials were concerned in it.

The trial was a Roman trial conducted before the prosecutor and was in every way in conformity with law. Pilate urged the prosecutors to withdraw their charge, but, upon their refusal to do so, was forced to pronounce Jesus guilty. There was no formal trial before the Sanhedrin, but merely an investigation akin to our Grand Jury proceeding.

There is no dearth of books and articles on the subject. The trial of Jesus has been considered from every point of view, historical, legal, and theological, Christian, Jewish, and pagan. The results have been widely divergent. To present a new viewpoint is, in itself, an achievement, and that Professor Husband has indubitably done in at least one question and has defended it with his usual keenness and learning. Much of what he presents is not new, but it is set forth with an engaging vividness and directness that are rare enough in such treatises.

The difficulties of the problem are the most serious that can confront an historical investigation. There is only one source, or group of sources, and its historical value is questioned. If the account of the trial that we find in the Gospels be accepted as true, *verbatim et literalim*, the only problem presented would be that of reconciling apparently divergent stories. A critical attitude, however, imposes obligations of a different sort. Criticism, 'higher' and 'lower', has been busy upon these texts for generations. Not all the results can possibly be right, because they are, for the most part, contradictory. Which of them does the author adopt?

Professor Husband does not tell us. His attitude is plainly critical. However, he apparently presumes in his readers a general acquaintance with the critical analysis of the Gospels, but he does not set forth systematically his own attitude toward them, even in the chapter entitled *The Gospel Text*. We are left to infer from casual side remarks (105, 257) that he accepts the received opinion that Mark is the earliest and John the latest of the Gospels; yet for certain steps of his argument he relies upon John more fully than most historians would care to do. This uncertainty is a disturbing element in a book of this character.

To determine the exact date of the crucifixion, Dr. Husband makes use of the investigations of Gauss, Ideler, and others (44). He sets forth tables of new and full moon nearest the vernal equinox at the meridian of Jerusalem for the years within which the crucifixion must have taken place. As stated before, he comes to the conclusion that the correct date is Friday, April 3, 33. One might follow his argument more readily if he gave us the least hint as to how he determined the day of the week—which is of course the crux of the whole question. Indeed, the author takes his task quite too lightly. There are

many points about the Jewish calendar of that time of which we know nothing. It is likely enough that the month began with an actual new moon, but we have scarcely an inkling of the intercalary system in use and of the method by which the religious year was made to fit the civil (perhaps the Macedonian) year. Until better knowledge on these questions is obtained, dogmatism on the subject is scarcely permissible.

The author is convinced that the arrest was made by officers of the Sanhedrin, without Roman assistance. To establish it, he completely rejects the "multitude with swords and staves", of the Synoptics, and accepts the version of John 18.3, 12, in which we hear of "a band and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees", and later, of a troop (*σπειρα*) and captain (*χιλαρχος*). Now, if Professor Husband is inclined to rate the historical value of John higher than is usually done, he owes his readers a statement of the fact and his reasons for it. So pronounced is the usual critical attitude on this matter that Wendland, *Urchristliche Literaturformen*, 292, classes the fourth Gospel among the apocryphal ones. Similarly Professor Husband quotes John 18.28 (37) to the effect that "the Jews entered not into the praetorium that they might not be defiled but might eat the pass-over", and uses that statement (38) as a basis for further argument. However, Jewish law knows of no defilement that could arise from the mere entrance into the house of a pagan. It is hard to believe that a Jewish writer would have made such a blunder. Mark and Matthew do not make it.

As to the words *σπειρα* and *χιλαρχος*, it is true that later lexicographers make the terms rather indefinite. This is perfectly natural, since these lexicographers had to cover the changing usage of many epochs. But even in the lexicographers, *σπειρα* always denotes an organized military unit. Whatever the word meant to Polybius, and the author of Judith (89-90), it will be remembered that these books are perhaps three hundred years earlier than John. When John was written, *σπειρα* quite commonly denoted the Roman *cohors*, and, without explicit statement to the contrary, it is highly probable that it would have conveyed only that sense to a reader of the second or the third century.

But Dr. Husband's chief attack is directed against the current view of the trial before the Sanhedrin. Both Jewish and Christian writers have been struck by the fact that the trial of Jesus, as described in the Gospels, was conducted in a way wholly at variance with the procedure set forth in the Talmud for capital trials. There are three possible inferences that may be drawn from this discrepancy. The Talmud may be right, in which case the events depicted in the New Testament cannot have occurred. Or the Talmud may be unreliable—which leaves the historical accuracy of the Gospel narrative untouched. Or, again, the Talmudic account of the regular procedure may be credited, and the trial may be declared to have been conducted in deliberate and violent disregard of law.

Dr. Husband's view is that the events happened much as described in the Gospels, but that the Sanhedrin was sitting not as a court but as an examining and accusing body. To make this clear, he cites the procedure used in Egypt—a procedure recently disclosed to us by the papyri.

However, despite the author's confident statement, the Gospel account resembles the procedure of the papyri as little as it does that of the Talmud. It is obviously a strange thing, to equate the nome-strategus with a board of seventy men. Then, it is quite illegitimate to transfer the Egyptian system to Syria. The organization of Egypt was unique. Again, the cases cited by Dr. Husband are almost exclusively civil, and therefore hardly in point. And, finally, there is nowhere in our evidence the remotest suggestion that the Sanhedrin ever had the functions here ascribed to it.

Professor Husband, in this connection, is compelled to examine the Talmudic passages. Unfortunately, the difficulties of sources are enormous. As in the case of Gospel criticism, the author seems to presuppose a general knowledge of the nature and composition of the Talmud. In that, he probably does his readers more than justice. It would have been better to state briefly that the text of the Talmud, the Mishna, handed down by oral tradition from early times, was compiled into its present form about the year 200 A. D., and that the lectures and discussions upon the Mishna which took place in the Palestinian and Babylonian academies were collected into the Gemaras of Jerusalem (circa 375 A.D.), and of Babylon (circa 500 A.D.). It is the latter, i.e. the Babylonian Gemara, that is generally referred to, when the term Talmud is used without further qualification.

While it is in no sense a mysterious book, the Talmud is a very difficult one. The Mishna, written in Hebrew, is concise and obscure to the last degree. The Gemaras, written in Aramaic, are extremely discursive and contain matter of the most heterogeneous character and origin. The difficulties are enhanced by the fact that textual criticism of the Talmud is in its infancy and that there is no satisfactory translation. The French and German translations are incomplete. The English translation, by Rodkinson, used by Dr. Husband, was prepared with an incredible lack of care and conscience, so that it is practically worthless. The result is that Dr. Husband, in his use of the Talmud, has been compelled to rely upon very inexpert guidance. Most of the citations in Chapter V are wrong. While that may be mainly due to lapses in proofreading, there are cases which cannot be so explained, such as on page 128, where Dr. Husband cites, as from the Talmud, something that really forms part of an eleventh century commentary, not upon the Talmudic passage, but upon the Biblical quotation contained in it. Again, on page 115, the phrase, "as in the case of Jesus and others", does not occur at all in the passage from which it is cited, which,

incidentally, should have been "Sanhedrin, 41 a", not "4, fol. 37". There are further serious errors in the renderings of passages on pages 113, 117, 133, 154.

It may also be stated that it is usual to quote the Mishna by chapter and section, and to cite the Gemara by folio and page. To depart from that method, as the author often does, compels the examination of many pages in order to verify the reference. Once (126), he cites the Jerusalem Talmud by section and folio. This involves a search through four columns of fine print, each of which contains about 120 lines. The passage was finally determined to be, not "1, fol. 18", but "1, fol. 19, c, line 26".

As to the question of the trial before the Sanhedrin, Dr. Husband seems to have attached insufficient importance to one circumstance which is emphasized in most discussions of the subject. Whatever may be the historical value of the Synoptics for details, it is clear that they wish to convey the belief that the trial of Jesus was flagrantly illegal. That one fact doubtless represents a tradition in the Christian community and far outweighs the testimony of the Gospels as to what actually happened at the hearing before the Sanhedrin. And it is easily possible that, in its main outline, the Synoptic account is true. We must remember that the High Priest was little better than a Roman appointee, since he owed his office to one of the Herodian princes who had received the right of appointment from Rome. That he should seize one whom he deemed to be a dangerous agitator and condemn him to death by a packed jury—we are not told that a complete court was summoned—is quite probable indeed, and is still the most plausible theory, under the circumstances.

Dr. Husband properly rejects the common statement that Jesus was condemned for 'blasphemy'. If by that word is meant the offense stated in Lev. 24. 13-16, the term is plainly inaccurate. The crime of perversion of the people, 'false prophesy', is a capital one, according to the Pentateuch (Deut. 13.5), and this may have been the charge brought against Jesus.

The last part of the book (234 ff.) deals with the Roman trial. The author, following Hirschfeld and Liebenam, correctly points out that the procurator was in no sense the vicar of the Syrian legate, but had an independent authority conferred directly by the princeps. This independence, however, is not to be inferred from the phrase *ius gladii*, which merely extended his jurisdiction over Roman citizens as well as provincials, limited by the *ius provocationis* (cf. Cagnat, s.v. Procurator, in Daremberg et Saglio, Dictionnaire des Antiquités.) The procurator took the place of the earlier provincial quaestor,—without, however, completely rendering that office obsolete. And even in Republican times we hear of a *quaestor pro praetore* (Sallust, Cat. 21. 1), who probably acted much as an independent procurator did. Yet we must remember that Judea had shortly before been an appanage of Syria (Josephus, Ant. 17.13. 5; 18.1.1);

that the Syrian governor was the procurator's close neighbor and his superior in rank, and that the special commission to Vitellius (175 L: Tacitus, Ann. 6. 32) may have been couched in general indefinite terms like the *senatus consultum* cited by Caesar (B.G. 1.35). Dr. Husband is in error in supposing that the latter procurator had no independent jurisdiction at all. He did have a limited jurisdiction of his own (Ulpian, Dig. 40.19. 9. 2).

The author seems to realize quite inadequately the measure of arbitrary power implicit in the proconsular imperium, delegated directly to the procurator. For that reason, the discussion of whether there was or was not a written indictment is largely futile.

According to Dr. Husband, the charge brought against Jesus when he was arraigned before Pilate was *maiestas*—for which it would have been better to cite the definition in Paul's Sentences, 5.29.1, than that of Ulpian (Digest 48. 4. 1). It is, however, more likely that the charge was *seditio* (Paul, Sent. 5.22. 1; Digest 48. 19. 38. 2), since crucifixion is mentioned among the penalties for this crime, but not for *maiestas*. In passing, it may be noted that the author's statement (267), "Nothing less than death was ever recognized as adequate for treason", is slightly inaccurate. Upon the *honestiores*, relegation was inflicted.

That the scourging was used to elicit a confession, as is suggested on page 268, is scarcely possible. Roman law, in earlier and later times, knew of torture for that purpose only in connection with slave testimony (Decree of Augustus, 8 A.D., Digest 48.18.8. pr.).

The Barabas incident seems to have been misinterpreted. The passage from the Digest cited on page 270 states that, in the time of Marcus, the withdrawal of a sentence by a proconsul had become obsolete, and it seems to imply that a rescript of Marcus and Verus made it illegal thereafter. Dr. Husband believes that between the conviction and sentence, as in our procedure, there was an appreciable interval. But the *sententia* here referred to contained both conviction and sentence. As stated on page 270, Barabas was probably awaiting such trial as a Roman administrator might choose to mete out to a man of his type. Again, on page 233, a rescript of Gratian is quoted (Cod. 9.4. 5) as though it applied only to convicted traitors and provided that execution shall "follow swiftly after conviction". However, the rescript is quite general and states that all prisoners shall either be convicted and punished or else freed from arrest as quickly as possible.

Another incident, apparently misunderstood, is that of Herod. The passages cited on page 264 do not at all bear out Dr. Husband's contentions. The first (Dig. 1. 18. 3) states as a general rule that governors have authority primarily over persons legally domiciled in their district, and only exceptionally over *extranei*. Another passage (Celsus, Dig. 48. 3. 11) states that an *extraneus* is to be tried by the local praeses. And he goes on to say, *illud a quibusdam observari solet ut*

cum cognovit et constituit, remittat illum cum elogio ad eum qui provinciae praeest unde is homo est. From the rescript of Caracalla (Cod. 3. 15. 1), the author omits the important phrase, 'or where the man is found'.

It would seem, accordingly, that either Pilate or Herod might have entertained the charge against Jesus and that it was purely a question of comity whether Pilate, who had physical control over his person, should turn him over to Herod or not.

On the same page, another citation of the Digest (49.16.3. pr.) is strangely misapplied. The actual facts are just the reverse (Dig. 48.3.9).

Sometimes Dr. Husband is at pains to prove what might safely be assumed. So he cites Caesar B.C. 3. 108 (doubtless a slip for 107), to show that a trial might take place in the open air. The passage, however, refers to jurisdiction rather than to place. Another somewhat hasty assumption is that the 'Acts of Pilate' are a source of any kind (235, 261). To attempt to obtain information about the actual trial from this book is as hopeful a proceeding as to expect to derive knowledge of Ezra or Enoch from some of the apocryphal books that bear their names.

The bibliography, while necessarily selected, is ample. One might add to it Adolf Büchler, *Das Synedrium im Jerusalem* (1902); Heinrich Laible, *Jesus Christus im Talmud* (1900)—which must be used with caution and with careful note of Dalman's corrections.

Diversity of judgment on controversial matters is inevitable. As has been seen, the reviewer and the author differ *to toto caelo* on many points. If the foregoing seems to be little more than a tabulation of such points, a wrong impression may readily be created. Even those who disagree with Dr. Husband at every step cannot fail to derive profit and stimulation from his presentation and anyone who undertakes to examine the important questions here discussed will be extremely ill-advised if he disregards this book.

NEWTOWN HIGH SCHOOL,
Elmhurst, New York City.

MAX RADIN.

Studies in Greek Prepositional Phrases; *διά, ἀπό, ἐκ, εἰς, ἐν*. Chicago University Dissertation. By Emily Helen Dutton. Chicago: distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries (1916). Pp. ix + 211.

Every student of Greek, or in fact of any foreign language, has been annoyed by the curiously erratic meaning of many prepositional phrases. Who could infer from a knowledge of the separate words the meaning of the English phrase, 'on purpose', or of the Greek phrase, *ἀπό σφύματος εἰπεῖν*, 'to speak from memory'? These and other so-called idiomatic phrases have developed independently of their component elements; they have become isolated from other locutions which contain one or more of the same words. English 'on purpose' is no longer closely associated

with such phrases as 'on top', 'on the spot', 'on time'; and it is less closely associated with the phrases 'my purpose', 'the purpose of the machine', 'to the purpose, etc.', than these are with one another. 'On purpose' has undergone an independent semantic development in which the other phrases cited have had no share. It has in short become virtually a compound word; its meaning can no more be learned by a process of grammatical analysis than can the meaning of such words as 'railroad' or 'typewriter'. Such phrases demand treatment in a dictionary or in a treatise more or less on the plan of a dictionary.

Dr. Dutton has undertaken to supply a comprehensive treatment of individualistic prepositional phrases in Greek. The task is too large for a dissertation, and so the author has limited herself for the time being to five prepositions, and to "classical Greek literature from Homer to the time of Aristotle", although there are illustrative citations outside of these limits. The first limitation is sound; it would perhaps have been better still to treat only one preposition at this time. The restriction of material is unfortunate. The treatment of later authors, inscriptions, and papyri from this point of view will have to be undertaken some day, and Dr. Dutton would have contributed more if she had chosen to treat more thoroughly a smaller part of her subject. A dictionary should rest upon as wide a base as possible.

The book consists, then, of brief articles on a large number of prepositional phrases. These will be of value for the interpretation of Greek authors, and to students of style (including those who are cultivating their own or their students' Greek style). A cursory reading and the verification of a number of references indicate that the work has been done with extraordinary accuracy—no mean virtue in a dictionary. Since the best editions and translations have been consulted, even inexperienced students will find here a safe guide. The users of the book would have been saved much trouble if the alphabetic arrangement had been adopted.

The author has chosen, however, to arrange her material according to meaning, use, grammatical form, etc. Such a classification, if wisely made, would serve the interests of a third group of readers, namely students of language as such, and in particular students of semantics. The material here presented is of the utmost scientific importance and some of it has not heretofore been accessible; but Dr. Dutton's classification is not scientific. In fact she nowhere gives evidence of acquaintance with the abundant recent literature on semantics, although she has made use of scientific grammars and etymological dictionaries (with the curious omission of Thumb's revision of Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik* and of Boisacq's *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque*). Through neglect of the semantic side of linguistic science she has left to others the easy task of reaping the

grain which she has laboriously sown. Will classical scholars never learn that the treatment of a linguistic subject demands linguistic training?

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

The Tradition of the Latin Accent. By James S. McLemore. University of Virginia (1917). Pp. 96.

Dr. McLemore undertakes to discuss, in this University of Virginia dissertation, the testimonia on the Latin accent from the point of view which his teacher, Professor FitzHugh, has made familiar under the name of the "tripudic theory". The reviewer does not find himself in agreement with this theory, but it would be unkind to attack the teacher over the student's head! It is enough to say that Dr. McLemore explains most of his material as due to the influence of those "hellenizing pragmatists", Tyrranio, Cicero, and Varro. Here and there he finds a scrap of evidence indicating that Latin accent was all the while a matter of stress upon the first syllable of every word; for example, Diomedes's phrase *plus sonal*, and the same author's description of the accent *velut anima vocis*; for a stress accent "is indeed the *anima vocis*—the vital principle of the word".

The bulk of the dissertation consists of a large number of passages from ancient authors dealing with Latin accent. All of this material and some more besides was collected forty years ago by F. Schoell, *Acta Societatis Philologae Lipsiensis* 6.73-215; but Dr. McLemore's chronological arrangement of the material furnishes an excuse for reprinting it. Unfortunately some of the most important passages from Cicero and Varro have been omitted, no doubt because they have already been discussed by Professor FitzHugh. Little attention seems to have been paid to the text of the passages cited; but, as far as noted, good editions have been used.

It would have been well to distinguish citations from the author's comments by different type. As it is, the reader who begins a passage from Quintilian finds himself half way through an account of a certain "tripudic" rhythm before he knows it.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

ESSEX COUNTY GREEK CLUB

The Essex County Greek Club, of which the late Dr. James F. Riggs was Secretary for the last fifteen years, will continue its meetings. Members and all others interested in the reading of the Greek Classics will kindly communicate with Mr. W. O. Wiley, 44 South Clinton Street, East Orange, New Jersey.

There came to hand lately a copy of a pamphlet of 288 large pages, entitled *University of Pennsylvania Schoolmen's Week Proceedings*, April 12-14, 1917. This was published by the University of Pennsylvania, as part of *The University Bulletins*, Seventeenth Series: No. 6, Part 1.

In the pamphlet are various matters of interest to students and teachers of the Classics, especially the following: *The Aim and Method of a College Teacher of the Classics*, John C. Rolfe, pages 202-209; *The Aim and Method of a Teacher of the Classics in the Secondary School*, Ellis A. Schnabel, 209-214; *Model Class in Latin*, Bessie R. Burchett, 214-216; *General Discussion*, 216-217.

C. K.